

No. 9(1)81-6Lab./10679.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Lauls Pvt. Ltd., Industrial Area, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 145 of 1981

between

SHRI PRAHLAD SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S LAULS PRIVATE LTD., INDUSTRIAL AREA, FARIDABAD.

Present.—

Shri H. R. Dua, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/31/81/24224, dated 14th May, 1981, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Lauls Private Ltd, Industrial Area, Faridabad and its workman Shri Prahlad Singh, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Prahlad Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. But on 11th August, 1981, the parties arrived at a settlement. The representative for the management filed a settlement Ex. M-1 by which the workmen withdraw his dispute and the workman shall not be entitled for reinstatement or re-employment. In view of the settlement I give my award that the dispute has been settled between the parties and there was no dispute left for adjudication.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Dated 11th September, 1981

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 804, dated 14th September, 1981.

Forwarded (for copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6Lab./10682.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Berrysons India (P) Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M.C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 203 of 1978

between

SHRI MOHAN RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BERRYSONS (INDIA P. LTD., MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD.

Present —

Shri Yoginder Singh, for the workman.

Shri S. L. Gupta, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. FD/55-73/31198 dated 6th July, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Baryons (India) P. Ltd. Mathura Road, Faridabad and its workman Shri Mohan Ram, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mohan Ram was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 1st January, 1979 :—

- (1) Whether the workman was a probationer? If so, with what effect?
- (2) Whether the workman had lost his lien on his job by remaining absent?
- (3) Whether termination of service of the workman was justified and in order?
- (4) Whether the workman is gainfully employed? If so, what effect?
- (5) Relief.

And the case was fixed for the evidence of the management, who examined Shri N.S. Begana as MW-1 and Shri Tilak Raj Gulati, Time-keeper, as MW-2 and closed its case. The workman examined himself as WW-1 and Shri Ram Parshad Morya as WW-2 and closed his case. Arguments were heard. Now I give my findings issue wise :—

Issue No. 1.—MW-1 stated that the workman joined service on 14th July, 1977, as helper on Rs. 170 per month. His appointment letter was Ex. M-1. It bears the signature of the workman at point A. He was on six months probation. The workman stated that he joined service on 11th January, 1977. He became permanent on 14th July, 1977.

I have gone through his demand notice and find that he has written that he had 1½ years service at his credit. He was appointed as helper at Rs. 170 per month but his attendance was marked w.e.f. 14th July, 1977. According to the management the workman was appointed w.e.f. 14th July, 1977 and the same date is mentioned in Ex. M-1. He admitted his signature on Ex. M-1 according to which he was appointed as helper on six months probation extendable by another six months. The date of appointment is mentioned as 14th July, 1977. No other evidence was produced by the workman to prove his service prior to 14th July, 1977. Therefore, I hold that the workman was a probationer.

Issue No. 2.—No evidence was led by the management on this issue, therefore, this issue is decided against the management.

Issue No. 3.—MW-1 stated that the workman absented himself from 29th January, 1978. Letter dated 2nd February, 1978, copy Ex. M-5 was sent to the workman under UPC. A reminder dated 6th February, 1978, copy Ex. M-6 and another letter dated 9th February, 1978, was sent to him under UPC postal receipts being Ex. M-8 to M-10. The workman did not report for duty, therefore, termination letter dated 14th February, 1978, copy Ex. M-11 sent to him by registered post postal receipt was Ex. M-12. Comments of the management sent to the Conciliation Officer was Ex. M-13. In cross-examination he stated that the workmen had gone on partial strike on the demand of overtime allowance. They were taken on duty at the direction of the Tribunal but the concerned workman had no connection with that case. Address of the workman was taken from his file. He denied the suggestion that he was victimised. M-2 stated that he knew the concerned workman. He used to mark attendance in the register which he had brought. The workman was absent w.e.f. 29th January, 1978 and his name was removed from 14th February, 1978. He used to receive leave application from the workmen but the concerned workman had not submitted any leave application. In cross-examination he stated that Shri Jit Bahadur and Shri Gulbadan Morya were also absent on 29th January, 1978. Their names were also removed on the same date. He had received instructions for removing their names.

WW-1 the concerned workman stated that he was not taken on duty by the management on 29th January, 1978, because the union had raised a demand for overtime. He was an active member of the union. Ex. W-1 was his wage slip. In cross-examination he stated that he had no proof of his service prior to 14th July, 1977. His address was 13/3, Mathura Road, Subhash Nagar Jhughi behind back of Frick India Ltd. He denied the suggestion that he was absent from 29th January, 1978. He also denied that the overtime dispute was not pending in February, 1978. He further stated that the demand was raised in October, 1977, but he had no copy of the demand notice. He did not know other demands raised by the union. WW-2 corroborated the version of WW-1. In cross-examination he stated that he was also removed from service. He denied the suggestion that because he was a terminated workman, therefore, he was deposing falsely against the management.

The learned representative for the management argued that the workman was a probationer and he was absent from 29th January, 1978 onwards. Notices were issued to him for joining duty. He further argued that the management witnesses were not examined on the matter of absence, nor anything was said by the concerned workman. On the other hand the learned representative for the workman argued that the workman had 1½ years service. He further argued that he was victimised.

I have gone through the demand notice and find that the workman had written that although he had worked earlier but his attendance was recorded with effect from 14th July, 1977 and his services were terminated on 28th January, 1978. I find that no suggestion was made to the management witnesses about the service prior to 14th July, 1977 by the workman even no question was put regarding absence of the workman even copy of demand notice for over time allowance and the circumstance in which 78 other workmen were re-instated by this Court was brought on the file. I find that there are three letters Ex. M-5 to M-7 in which the workman was called by the management to rejoin his duties. Original postal receipts are also placed on the file being Ex. M-8 to M-10. Termination letter Ex. M-11 was sent by registered post, postal receipt being Ex. M-12. Address on all the letters is the same. Therefore, I find that the management has proved its case of absence and abandonment of services. This issue is decided in favour of the management.

Issue No. 4.—I have held in issue No. 3 that the workman lost his lien on his job by remaining absent so termination of services of the workman by the management does not arise.

Issue No. 5.—The workman is not entitled to any relief.

While answering the reference, I give my award that the management did not terminate the services of the workman, rather on the other hand the workman lost his lien on his job by remaining absent. The workman is not entitled to any relief. I order accordingly.

Dated the 9th September, 1981.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 807, dated the 14th September, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6Lab/10683.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Delhi Faridabad Textile Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 380 of 1978

Between

SHRI GIRRAJ PARSHAD, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DELHI FARIDABAD
TEXTILE PRIVATE LTD., FARIDABAD

Present :

Shri Yoginder Singh for the workman.
Shri R. C. Sharma for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/18-78/38995, dated 28th August, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following disputes between the management of M/s. Delhi Faridabad Textile Private Ltd., Faridabad and its

workman Shri Girraj Parshad, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Girraj Parshad was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, following issues were framed on 4th June, 1979 :—

1. Whether the reference is bad in law on account of laches ?
2. Whether the workman is gainfully employed ? If so, to what effect ?
3. Whether the workman is not entitled to back wages in case termination of his services is found unjustified ?
4. Whether termination of services of the workman is justified and in order ?
5. Relief.

The termination had been effected after holding a domestic enquiry, therefore, the parties led their evidence first on the vires of the enquiry only. The enquiry was held to be proper by my order dated 28th October, 1980. The parties led their evidence on merits. The management examined Shri V.K. Agrawal, Ex-Executive Director as MW-2 and the workman examined Shri Dharmendra, Dy. Labour Commissioner as WW-3 and also again made his own statement as WW-1. Arguments were heard. I now give my findings issueswise :—

*Issue No. 1 :—*This is a legal issue and I find that services of the workman was terminated on 2nd November, 1974 and the demand notice is dated 15th November, 1974. Reference was made by the Government on 28th August, 1978 after a lapse of about four years. The Government makes a reference of the dispute under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is an administrative order and words "at any time" in section 10 are very significant. The Government has got power to refer the dispute at any time and it was not a judicial or quasi judicial function of the Government. I find support from 'Avon Services vs. Industrial Tribunal, Haryana 1979 ILLJ page 1, where the Government had power even to refer the dispute after its refusal, therefore, this issue is decided against the management.

*Issue No. 2.—*No evidence was led by the management, therefore, this issue is decided against the management.

*Issues No. 3, 4 and 5.—*During the course of proceedings the workman had filed Ex. W-1 copy of letter endorsement No. 2010, dated 22nd July, 1974 from the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Ballabgarh addressed to M/s. Delhi Faridabad Textile Private Ltd., Faridabad in which it is written that Shri B.L. Jain, Manager of the management had agreed to take back the concerned workman on duty. Shri Jain represented the management before the Conciliation Officer in all the cases. In this behalf MW-2 stated that he used to go to conciliation office along with Shri Jain. He was present when suggestion for taking back on duty of the concerned workman was made by Shri Dharmendra Nath, the then Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer verbally but it was not agreed by the management representative. WW-3 Shri Dharmendra Nath, Dy. Labour Commissioner stated that in April 1974 he was Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Ballabgarh circle. On 4th July, 1974 he was informed of strike by the Manager Shri M.L. Jain. He called the parties on 5th May, 1974 in his office. During negotiations it was revealed that Shri Girraj the concerned workman was assaulted in the factory at the instance of the management. He received injuries and the strike was due to the same fact. It was agreed during negotiations that the management will pay him Rs. 30 as costs of medical expenses and will withdraw charges levelled against him and he will be taken back on duty w.e.f. 10th July, 1974. He further stated that this settlement was at the request of the Manager who had given assurance that he will implement the same immediately. It was brought to his notice later on that the management had paid a sum of Rs. 30 to the workman but did not take him back on duty, therefore, he wrote letter Ex. M-5 to the management. All the workmen had resumed their duties and the strike was called off. In cross examination he stated that the disposal of the complaint took a fortnight because he contacted the management on telephone and the management was evading personal appearance in his office. The settlement was not written because the management had requested not to put the same into black and white for some administrative reason.

WW-1 stated that there were two unions in the factory. He was assaulted on 4th July, 1974 and the workman went on strike due to the same. The management chargesheeted him and in the conciliation meeting the management had agreed to pay Rs. 30 as medical aid because he was a victim of assault and it was further agreed that the chargesheet would be withdrawn and he will be taken back on duty.

I have gone through Ex. M-5 which is dated 24th July, 1974 addressed to the management and copy to Textile Mazdoor Union. The operative part of the letter is as under :—

"During the course of negotiation between the workman and the management of M/s. Delhi Faridabad Textile, Faridabad and other sister concerns held on 5th July, 1974 in connection with the

strike in the factories aforesaid, it was agreed verbally between the parties that Shri Girraj Singh shall be taken back on work on 10th July, 1974 and he shall not be charged for any misconduct. Shri B.L. Jain, Manager who represented all the managements in the above said proceedings had also given a sum of Rs. 30 to Shri Girraj Singh towards his expenses for medical treatment.

It has been complained to this office that the above referred verbal settlement has not been implemented. You are requested to honour the commitment of your authorities representative in this behalf.

Shri Dharmendra Nath WW-3 is presently posted as Dy. Labour Commissioner Faridabad circle and has categorically stated that the settlement was at the request of the management. I find from evidence that the management partially implemented the settlement by making payment of Rs. 30 to the concerned workman. It is also into evidence that the settlement was not put into black and white at the same time because the management had requested not to do so on some administrative reason best known to the management. I gather from the circumstance that the workman had gone on strike due to the assault on the concerned workman and tempers must have run high. Shri M.L. Jain was not produced by the management although the settlement is purported to at his instance. There is no reason or explanation given by the management as to why Shri Dharmendra Nath wrote letter Ex. M-5 to the management and why the same was not replied in case its contents were incorrect. I gather from the circumstances that after the strike was called off the management went back from their commitments. Shri Dharmendra Nath is a Senior Officer of the State Labour Department and I have no reason to disbelieve him. He in the best interest of industrial peace and harmony made settlement referred in Ex. M-5.

As regards the termination I find from the statement of Dy. Labour Commissioner that the management had agreed to withdraw the chargesheet and reinstated the workman instead his services were terminated. Thus I find that the termination was unjustified.

The management did not lead any evidence on the issue of gainful employment of the workman, therefore, I find it will be in the fitness of things if the workman is reinstated now. As regards the period of unemployment I find that the reference was made after a lapse of four years but the workman was not at fault for the delay. The period of unemployment is of about seven years. Considering this abnormal time taken by the case, I deviate from full back wages rule and allow 50 per cent of the back wages to the workman with all other benefits and continuity of service. I decided these issues accordingly.

While answering the reference I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified nor in order. The workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and all other benefits with 50 per cent back wages. I order accordingly.

Dated the 9th September, 1981.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer, Industrial
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 509, dated the 14th September, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer, Industrial
Tribunal Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6Lab./10876. In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Mac Metal Works, Plot No. 2, Gurukul Road, P.O. Amar Nagar, Faridabad :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference Nos. 96, 97 and 140 of 1980

between

S/SHRI NARINDER SINGH, MUKHTAYAR AHMAD AND LATAFAT HUSSAIN, WORKMEN
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. MAC METAL WORKS, PLOT NO. 2, GURUKUL
ROAD, POST OFFICE AMAR NAGAR, FARIDABAD

Shri R.L. Sharma for the workmen.

Shri J.S. Saroha for the management.

AWARD

These references Nos. 96, 97 and 140 of 1980 have been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order Nos. ID/FD/24-80/10731, 10749, dated 28th February, 1980 and 10535, dated 27th February, 1980 under Section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between S/Shri Narinder Singh, Mukhtiar Ahmed and Latafat Hussain, workmen and the management of M/s Mac Metal Works, Plot No. 2, Gurukul Road, Post Office Amar Nagar, Faridabad. The terms of the references were :—

Whether the termination of services of S/Shri Narinder Singh, Mukhtayar Ahmad and Latafat Hussain was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief are they entitled ?

After receiving these references, notices were sent to the parties. The workmen appeared but none was present on behalf of the management. And the *ex parte* award was sent in favour of the workman on 10th July, 1980 to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh,—vide letters Nos. 1144, 1145 and 1143, dated 16th July, 1980, respectively. These awards have been published in the Haryana Government Gazette on 12th August, 1980.

After the publication of these awards, the management filed the applications on 10th September, 1980 and 16th September, 1980 for setting aside the *ex parte* award dated 10th July, 1980. The notice was sent to the workman for 5th November, 1980 for reply and arguments on these applications. On 5th November, 1980 arguments heard and the *ex parte* award is set aside—subject to the payment of cost of Rs. 50 which was paid in each case. The parties filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 2nd January, 1981 as under :—

1. Whether the workman has abandoned his job by remaining absent from duty for more than 10 days and collected his full and final ? If so, to what effect ?
2. Whether the termination of services of the workman is proper, justified and in order ? If not, to what effect ?
3. Relief ?

On that day both the parties pray for consolidation of these references, because these references the same nature and against the same management. I exceed their request and all the references are consolidated. The evidence will be recorded in Reference No. 96 of 1980 of Shri Narinder Singh workman.

The management produced one witness Shri Harminder Singh, Manager as MW-1 and stated that the workman joined the service of the Company on 1st December, 1979, 24th June, 1979 and 1st July, 1979 as Polisher respectively. He further stated that they started remaining absent from 27th December, 1979, 22nd December, 1979 and 15th December, 1979 without giving any intimation and their names were struck off from the role of the Company after two weeks. The workmen raised a complaint in the Labour Inspector Office and collected their full and final payment,—vide Exhibit M-1 and M-2, and M-3. These payments were made before the Labour Inspector on 27th February, 1980 and closed their case.

Then the cases fixed for the evidence of the workmen. The dates were given to the workmen for the evidence on 6th March 1981, 3rd April, 1981, 30th April, 1981, 3rd June, 1981, 30th July, 1981, 26th August, 1981, 4th September, 1981 and 9th September, 1981 but they did not come for their evidence. On 9th September, 1981, the last date of hearing, the representative of the workmen Shri R.L. Sharma made a statement that he had tried to contact the workmen few times. The date of their evidence were also told to them but they had not come forward. He further stated that he had no further instructions from the workmen to pursue their case and closed his evidence.

My finding on issue No. 1 is as under :—

Issue No. 1—

The management produced one witness as MW-1 of Shri Harminder Singh, Manager which was stated that the workmen S/Shri Narinder Singh, Mukhtayar Ahmad and Latafat Hussain remained themselves absent from the duty without giving any information. The management also produced the vouchers of full and final payment which are Exhibit M-1, M-2 and M-3. According to Exhibit M-1 to M-3, the full and final payment of Rs. 619.07, Rs. 555 and Rs. 290.25 to the workmen respectively. The management did not terminate the services of the workmen Shri Narinder Singh, Mukhtayar Ahmad and Latafat Hussain. It is a case of abandoned their job by remaining absent from duty by the workmen and collected their full and final payment. In view of the un-rebutted evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my finding gets support from the absention of the workmen in the proceedings of their evidence of these references. So I decide this issue in favour of the management and against the workmen.

When the issue No. 1 is decided in favour of the management, there is no need to discuss on Issue Nos. 2 and 3. So I hold that the workmen Shri Narinder Singh, Mukhtayar Ahmad and Latafat Hussain abandoned

their services themselves and also received their full and final payment. So the workmen are not entitled to any relief. No order as to costs.

Dated, the 16th September, 1981

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2798, dated 17th September, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-6-Lab. 10664.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Dalmia Cement Bharat Ltd., Ballabgarh :—

BEFORE SHRI M.C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 227 of 1981

between

SHRI SHISH RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DALMIA CEMENT
BHARAT LTD., BALLABGARH

Present :—

None for the workman.

Shri V. Hoon for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/63/81/32504, dated 6th July, 1981, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Dalmia Cement Bharat Ltd., Ballabgarh, and its workman Shri Shish Ram, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Shish Ram was justified and in order ? If so, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The representative for the management appeared but the workman did not appear despite service, and the case was ordered to be dismissed for non-prosecution by the workman. I, therefore, dismiss the case for non-prosecution by the workman.

Date, the 28th August, 1981.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer, Industrial
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 788, dated 9th September, 1981.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer, Industrial
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad,